



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,632	10/12/2001	Douglas P. Brown	10149	1656
26890 7590 03/28/2008				
JAMES M. STOVER TERADATA CORPORATION 2835 MIAMI VILLAGE DRIVE MIAMISBURG, OH 45342				
EXAMINER				
WOO, ISAAC M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2166				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/28/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* DOUGLAS P. BROWN  
and  
JEETENDRA CHAWARE

---

Appeal 2007-3774  
Application 09/976,632  
Technology Center 2100

---

Decided: March 28, 2008

---

Before JAMES D. THOMAS, HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, and  
STEPHEN C. SIU, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

THOMAS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1 through 33. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

As best representative of the disclosed and claimed invention,  
independent claim 1 is reproduced below:

1. A method of presenting database demographics information in a database system, comprising:

providing a graphical user interface screen;  
receiving selection of an item in the graphical user interface screen;  
and

in response to selection of the item, accessing database demographics information stored in a database system and displaying the database demographics information in graphical format.

The following reference is relied on by the Examiner:

Bertram US 6,369,820 B1 Apr. 9, 2002  
(filed Jun. 2, 1998)

All claims on appeal, claims 1 through 33, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bertram.

Rather than repeat verbatim the positions of the Appellants and the Examiner, reference is made to the Brief (no Reply Brief has been filed) for the Appellants' positions, and to the Answer for the Examiner's positions.

## OPINION

For the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Answer, as amplified slightly here, we sustain the rejection of all claims on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Appellants argue independent claims 1, 17, and 32 collectively. No arguments are presented in the Brief as to any dependent claim on appeal. Appellants' arguments focus, for example, on the feature at the end of representative independent claim 1 on appeal of accessing database demographics information and displaying this information in graphical

format and essentially corresponding features recited in independent claim 32. We note, however, that independent claim 17 merely recites the desirability of displaying the information in graphical format rather than positively reciting its display because of the use of the language "for display."

More specifically, Appellants' positions at pages 4 and 5 of the Brief essentially urge that Bertram does not teach the presence or use of a database, and that this reference also fails to teach the existence of demographic information that relates to a database.

The Examiner has addressed these positions head on in the Response to Argument portion of the Answer at pages 10 and 11 with which we fully agree. The Examiner makes mention of a particular computer dictionary definition of the word "database" to which there is no Reply Brief to contradict. Thus, the Examiner's position is such that the reference teaches the database to the extent recited in the claims.

Appellants' arguments to the contrary notwithstanding, as to figure 1B of Bertram, we agree with the Examiner's views that such a database as claimed is depicted in the network 20 in this figure. The computer system 10 from figure 1A is shown as a distributed plurality in figure 1B. Moreover, the description of figure 1B at column 3, lines 19 through 26, clearly suggests to the artisan, if not clearly indicating to the artisan, that the plurality of computer systems depicted there may be considered a database for purposes of claim interpretation as well as the particular teachings that generally diverse types of computer systems, including servers, are contemplated to comprise the structural network 20 in figure 1B. The network is stated to comprise any number of computer systems that are

depicted in figure 1A. These teachings and showings are consistent with the discussion of the prior art at column 1 of Bertram.

As to the type of information displayed, Appellants essentially define this in the abstract of their disclosure as including information relating to disk utilization, row count, average row size of tables, statistical information, and blocks of information distributed across a table. Appellants' admitted prior art discussion at Specification pages 1 and 2 admits that it was known in database systems that this type of information was presented or otherwise displayed.

Moreover, to the extent Appellants argue the term "capacity management" from columns 1 and 2 of Bertram, the monitors that keep track of each of the systems in figures 1A, 1B include monitors of CPU utilization, disk space availability, the number of bytes sent by a system, the number of bytes sent by a system, and the number of bytes received by a given system as discussed in the paragraph at column 3, lines 27 through 38 and generally at column 1. Not only does the Examiner's reliance upon figures 4A and 4E depict such information that is displayed in graphical format, figure 2 of Bertram also shows that it was known to display such information in a graphical display 50 as well.

In view of the Examiner's positions in the Answer and our additional analysis provided in this Decision, Appellants have not shown any error in the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 through 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Therefore, the decision of the Examiner is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

clj

JAMES M. STOVER  
TERADATA CORPORATION  
2835 MIAMI VILLAGE DRIVE  
MIAMISBURG, OH 45342